



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

basis to give the student a satisfactory working vocabulary. What we are asked to do in the universities, and what we want to do, is to teach Greek as literature, and that from the very beginning. But this we cannot do if we have to spend much time in teaching words and forms. Literature is noble thought in noble form, and of the two nobilities the noble form is the essential nobility. To elaborate this point would require a separate paper. Forms are apprehended by the intellect, form, noble form, makes its appeal to the spirit. We want in the universities to get the student on beyond the point where Greek touches the intellect to where it touches the spirit, and helps to produce the 'by-product' of character.

To do this to a greater degree one thing that is necessary, one thing that is indispensable, is greater facility in reading. If a student were to master such a body of words and phrases as I have here spoken of, I believe his facility in reading would be greatly increased.

D. A. MACRAE

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

REVIEW

A Short History of Greek Literature, from Homer to Julian. By Wilmer Cave Wright. New York: American Book Company (1907). Pp. 543.

Mrs. Wright's study of Julian and her reviews of classical books which have appeared at sundry times in the Nation have revealed her independence of judgment, her marked literary skill, and the breadth and catholicity of her learning. She was admirably equipped to write a manual of Greek literature, and the work which we have before us is, as one would have confidently expected, well done. In the brief space of 517 pages we have a lucid survey of Greek literature down to Julian, divided into twenty-three well-selected chapters, each chapter accompanied by a serviceable bibliography of editions, important monographs and articles, and translations. At the end is a full chronological table, followed by a good index.

The author has endeavored to adapt the treatise to "the reader who, though little or not at all acquainted with the classics, realizes that he cannot appreciate any other literature, least of all his own, unless he can relate its masterpieces to the types set, once for all, by the Greeks", and "the student of Greek who, in his second or third year at college, will profit immensely by a rapid survey of the whole field of Greek literature". In spite of the often conflicting needs and limitations of these two classes of readers Mrs. Wright has succeeded in giving us an account of Greek literature that, to a greater extent than any other book of the kind in English, satisfies the legitimate demands of both. It is not a book for the general public—it is too scholarly for that; nor for the indolent or ill-trained college student—it is

too serious and thoughtful for members of the "undesirable class". Its appeal is rather to the men and women of culture, in and out of college, who need a competent guide through the ten centuries in which the Greek race developed and brought to perfection the great permanent types of literature and laid the foundations for the intellectual life of modern Europe.

Mrs. Wright's literary estimates are clearly her own, and are set forth in a style so attractive that one is tempted not to criticize even if he does not accept her view. But a tendency is detected here and there to assume that the author's judgment and taste are more widely shared by others than is the case. The strictures upon the faults of Thucydidean style (p. 182) are fair enough, though perhaps given too great prominence. But in the statement with which the paragraph opens, "All praise, but few enjoy, Thucydides", the author falls into the manner of the essayist rather than of the historian of literature. And the statement cannot be accepted as true. The unfavorable estimate of Euripides (p. 239) is likewise fortified by assertions that are not historically correct. The standing of Euripides with his contemporaries as revealed in the *Frogs* shows that he was not "out of sympathy with his time and with the average Athenian". Compare p. 298, where Euripides is properly called "the delight of the Athenian stage". His victories in the contests probably numbered, not five, but, as the Vatican MS. states, fifteen; five may have been the number of his victories at the Dionysia alone. The criticism of Polybius is introduced by the assertion that "he is not read". As literature? Neither is Mommsen, nor Eduard Meyer. In spite of his obvious faults of style, which are here well catalogued, is it fair to urge against him that he "used the common dialect with all its neologisms" which were to be so carefully avoided by the later purists?—the first approach to the language of St. Paul? Are we bidden at this day to accept the standards of the Atticist reactionaries? We are nowhere given a clear account, by the way, of what Atticism was, nor of its far-reaching influence. The Alexandrian scholars are generally referred to with the respect which is due them, though their work is not summarized anywhere; but we regret that Pope's ignorant witticism is invoked on page 487 without at least a note of disapproval. There were Alexandrians and Alexandrians.

The most difficult chapter in the book to write is in a sense the most successful—that on Homer. The long history of the Homeric question is traced dispassionately and sanely. It would be difficult to direct the student to a better discussion of it any-

¹ "Antiseptic" (p. 45) and "unchaperoned" (p. 286) are interesting neologisms in criticism, but both objectionable because not illuminating but misleading.

where. But for the purpose of this book it may be questioned whether there is not too much Homeric criticism and too little Homer in the chapter. The addition of a dozen pages on the poems themselves would be desirable in a revision, and would bring this chapter into greater harmony with the treatment of other authors. In general the reader is given a fair idea of the contents of an author as well as of his place in the history of his branch of literature and of his literary merit. In the case of writers whose works are lost but whose position in Greek literature is assured, either by the opinion of the ancients themselves or by their traceable influence, there is generally little to object to and much to praise. The discussions of the lyric poets who are known to us only through scanty fragments, of the early philosophers, and of the early rhetoricians and sophists may be selected for special commendation. On the other hand, it is somewhat remarkable that of the tragic poets after the great triad only Agathon is mentioned, and not Carcinus, Astydamas and Theodectas, and that of the poets of the Middle Comedy only Antiphanes and Alexis, of the New only Diphilus, Philemon and Menander are named. The New Comedy cannot be understood without the background of both the tragedy and the comedy of the fourth century, and of the leading figures of this period we chance to be exceptionally well informed through Aristotle and other contemporary sources. A paragraph on the extensive letter literature is also to be desired, especially on the later purely literary letters, which are only casually referred to. The most serious single omission is the absence of all reference to the New Testament writers. They deserve a separate chapter; see Mahaffy's chapter in his *Progress of Hellenism*.

The least satisfactory part of the book, in the reviewer's opinion, is the treatment of dramatic history in the otherwise excellent chapters on the dramatic poets. Aristotle does not tell us a great deal on these subjects, but that little is precious and should be faithfully handed down together with such increments to our knowledge as have come to us through the recovery of some of the sources of information possessed by Aristotle and assumed by him to be known to his instructed hearers. It will not do to assume (p. 186) that "both tragedy and comedy were derived from the choral dances in honor of Dionysus"; this is to ignore the fundamental difference between the Dorian dithyramb and the Attic *komos*. The satyric element should receive greater emphasis, as should the probable course of the evolution of the tragic tetralogy out of the satyrdrama. The structure of the Old Attic Comedy as seen in Aristophanes is far from being "already closely akin to tragedy". "Prologus, Parados and Exodus", the author says, "with Episodes of arbi-

trary number and length, are all there". But the *parodos* has a structure all its own, while the episodes are so unlike those of tragedy in number, position and function as to suggest an origin quite different from that of the episodes in tragedy. The researches of Humphreys, Zielinski, Poppelreuter, Kaibel, Körte, Mazon and others have been so fruitful of illuminating results, have added so greatly to our understanding of Aristophanes and his predecessors back to Epicharmus, that Attic comedy can no longer properly be discussed in the old-fashioned way. Epicharmus (whose floruit is placed a quarter century too late) almost certainly did not employ a chorus (p. 273). And the comic chorus certainly did not perish (pp. 305, 307) at the close of the fifth century. We find a lively remnant of it even in the new plays of Menander. The allusion to the choregia in Arist. *Ran.* 404 and scholiast and the joke of the comic poet Strattis have been misunderstood. There is no authority for the statement (p. 520) that the Attic state assumed control of the tragic choruses in 508, that Aeschylus's first exhibition was in 499, that Aeschylus chose to live in Sicily after the rise of Sophocles to the prominence of a rival (p. 143). The first comic contest under the auspices of the state was held in 486. Comedy and tragedy were taken into the *Lenaea* only in the late forties and thirties respectively. At the City Dionysia the number of competing tragic poets was three, of comic poets five, except during the major portion of the Peloponnesian War. Euripides was not "virtually defeated" (p. 239) in 455 when he was last with the Peliades; nor can we properly refer to the "third prize" in tragedy. At the *Lenaea* three comedies and sometimes, at least, two tragedies were given in the fifth century. Down to 386 old tragedies could be brought out in competition with new; the privilege of reproduction seems not to have been confined to the plays of Aeschylus. The statement which the author repeats on p. 214 is due to the joke which Aristophanes puts into the mouth of Aeschylus to the effect that his plays had not died with him. We know of no instance of a poet competing with two plays (p. 276); the hypothesis to the *Vespae* rightly attributes the *Proagon* to Philonides, and Aristophanes, as we now know, was victorious with the *Vespae* (p. 289), which Philonides brought out for him. The epigraphical records of victories show that the archon granted the chorus to Aristophanes himself, and that the victory was officially his, even when he committed the play to another to put upon the stage for him. The statement about the *Andromache* (p. 250) should be modified accordingly. The second *Pax* was brought out at the *Lenaea*; Apollodorus was the leading actor in it. The *Plutus* was first at the *Lenaea* in 388. Antiphanes wrote no play *Alceste* (p. 306). Phile-

mon is shown by contemporary records to have been a Syracusan by birth and not from Soli (pp. 308, 522). The first victory of Crates was in 450 (pp. 280, 520). Eupolis lived till ca. 410 (p. 281). Aristophanes won a victory at the Dionysia in 425 or 424—a prouder victory, we may surmise, than the Lenaeon victory with the Knights (p. 286). The date of Aristophanes's death, as of his birth, is unknown (p. 303). Menander made his début in 324, not in 321 (p. 309). Pericles was 40 years old ca. 454 (p. 521). The beginning of the career of Agathon was in 416, of Alexis ca. 356 (521). The author's method of indicating the period of an author by an assumed floruit at the age of forty is very misleading when the only fixed date in a writer's career which the ancients record is that of some specific event or achievement. The chronological table should be thoroughly revised and misleading calculations due to this practice eliminated.

A manual which combines so many points of excellence as this will undoubtedly undergo many revisions. In the hope that this prophecy may come true a few minor matters may be mentioned in conclusion. There should be some reference to Wilamowitz's opinion about the so-called Alexandrian 'canon' of the lyric poets, and also to his discussion of Solon's poems in his *Aristoteles und Athen*: The traces of Sappho's influence on Theocritus deserve mention; see Cook's article in the *Classical Review*, which does not exhaust the subject. An allusion to the relation of the dithyramb to Apollo should be inserted on p. 129. In the *Eumenides* Athena does not give the "casting vote" (p. 201), but rather awards the verdict to the defendant because of the tie. The references to the number of actors employed in the extant plays should be revised in view of Rees's recent treatise. Greater significance is to be attached to the absence of a scenic background in the four early plays of Aeschylus (p. 190). Present-day opinion on the question of the stage in the fifth century is not so divided as is intimated on p. 191. The view of the staging of the *Prometheus* is untenable (pp. 192, 197). The *eccyclema* is distinctly overworked (pp. 193, 204, 206, 207, 219). It was probably not represented on the stage in the grotesque shape of a cow (p. 199). In the *Acharnians* Euripides is not represented "in his garret" (p. 285), or "swinging absurdly in a stage machine" (p. 295), but is simply sitting in his study ἀναβάνη, with his legs drawn up to hold the writing tablet, as Blass showed years ago. We could wish that the work of American writers were more freely mentioned in the bibliographies, at the expense if necessary of worthless things like Kynaston's *Theocritus* (twice mentioned), or antiquated books like Sommerbrodt's *Scaenica*; for example, Seymour's *Selections from Pindar*, Burgess on *Epidictic Literature*, White on the *Stage in Aristophanes*, Humphreys's *Antigone*, Morgan's translation of *Xenophon*

on *Horsemanship*. Of foreign books the following should certainly be added: Bethe's *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Theaters im Altertum*, Barnet's *Primer of the Greek Drama*, Bodensteiner's *Szenische Fragen*, Neil's *Knights*, Mazon's *Pax*, Croiset's *Aristophane et les parties politiques*, Meineke's *Historica critica comicorum Graecorum*, Mahaffy's *Silver Age of the Greek World* (the first edition under the title *Greek World under Roman Sway* is out of print), and Paley's *Aeschylus*.

EDWARD CAPPS

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

The following sentences, quoted from a circular issued by the Classical Association of England, admirably express the purposes of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States:

The objects of the Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular:

(a) To impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education;

(b) To improve the practice of classical teaching by free discussion of its scope and methods;

(c) To encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries;

(d) To create opportunities for friendly intercourse and co-operation among all lovers of classical learning in this country.

Membership of the Association is open to all persons of either sex who are in sympathy with its objects.

From the statement of the objects of the Association it will be seen that it appeals for support to all who are interested in the study of the Classics, to University Teachers, to Head and Assistant Masters and Mistresses of Schools, to Private Tutors and Private Students, and, not less, to all those who, though actively occupied in business, politics, or the work of the learned professions, retain their interest in the classical literatures and civilisations, and a belief in their humanising influence.

One of my students has translated Horace Odes 3. 9. 17-18

quid si prisca redit Venus
diductosque iugo cogit aeneo

by 'What if old Venus return and unite us with a brass ring?' Recently, in sight translation, for *Regina stat incerta* a girl fearlessly suggested 'The queen stands in a cart'.

L. B. MITCHELL

WILLIAMS AND VASHTI COLLEGE, Alledo, Illinois

THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

The first informal meeting of the New York Latin Club will take place at 10 o'clock on Saturday morning, January 23, at the Packer Institute, on Joralemon Street, near Clinton, Brooklyn (take Subway to Borough Hall; Joralemon Street runs west of Borough Hall). The meeting will be given over to a symposium on the function of Latin Prose Composition in the teaching of Latin. There will be short addresses and discussions by a number of teachers, including Professor McCrea, Messrs. Bice, Jenks, Radin, Miss MacVeagh and others.